

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended.

Claims 1, 7, 16 and 29 have been amended. Claims 2, 11 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1, 3-10, 12-16 and 18-32 are presented for examination. The following remarks are in response to the final Office Action, mailed January 22, 2007, and the Advisory Action mailed October 10, 2007.

35 U.S.C. § 102 Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 5-10, 12, 14-16, 18, 20-21 and 28-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Leppek, U.S. Patent No. 6,397,336 ("Leppek").

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method of sharing resources on a social network, comprising:
monitoring communications between a plurality of users and a user having
a shared resource coupled to a computer system of the user, the
shared resource to be shared amongst one or more of the plurality of
users;
determining social network data from the communications between each
of the plurality of users and the user having the shared resource,
wherein each of the plurality of users has an ongoing relationship
with the user having the shared resource and the social network
data is based on varying degrees of interactions between each of
the plurality of users and the user having the shared resource,
wherein the communication includes communicating via emails
between each of the plurality of user having the shared resources,
wherein the emails are identified and counted;
determining an access level for each of the plurality of users based on the
social network data including the identified and counted emails;
and
configuring an access control list to provide each of the plurality of users
the access level determined for accessing the shared resource.
(emphasis added)

As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the reference and the pending claims. However, for the sake of

expediting issuance of this case, Applicants propose additional amendments to the pending claims and submit the following remarks.

Leppek discloses a “*network resource security services control system comprises an integrated arrangement of security services, that are operative to control the ability of an information storage and retrieval network user to have access to and communicate with one or more information resources within the network. The security access control mechanism monitors activity associated with a user's attempt to and actual conducting of data communications with respect to a system resource, and controllably modifies one or more security relationships of a security association that has been established among the users and resources of the system, in dependence upon one or more characteristics of the monitored activity, in such a manner that affects the ability of the system user to conduct data communications with respect to a system resource.*” (Abstract; emphasis added)

In contrast, claim 1, as amended, in pertinent part, recites “determining social network data from the communications between each of the plurality of users and the user having the shared resource, wherein each of the plurality of users has an ongoing relationship with the user having the shared resource and the social network data is based on varying degrees of interactions between each of the plurality of users and the user having the shared resource, wherein the communication includes communicating via emails between each of the plurality of user having the shared resources, wherein the emails are identified and counted; determining an access level for each of the plurality of users based on the social network data including the identified and counted emails” (emphasis added) Leppek's integrated network security access control system comprising an integrated arrangement of security services is not the same as determining social network data from the communications between each of the plurality

of users and the user having the shared resource . . . the communication includes communicating via emails between each of the plurality of user having the shared resources, wherein the emails are identified and counted; determining an access level for each of the plurality of users based on the social network data including the identified and counted emails” (emphasis added). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 7 and 16 contain limitations similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 16 and their dependent claims.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 2, 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leppek in view of Hirata, U.S. Patent No. 6,925,567 (“Hirata”).

Claims 2, 11 and 17 have been cancelled without prejudice.

Claims 4, 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leppek in view of Anand, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,044,466 (“Anand”).

Claims 22, 24 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leppek in view of Aronson, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,654,787 (“Aronson”).

Claims 23, 25 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Leppek in view of Aronson and further in of Goldberg, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,711,570 (“Goldberg”).

Claims 4, 13, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 depend from one of claims 1, 7 and 16 and thus include all the limitations of their corresponding base claim. Accordingly,

Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 13, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27.

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

Invitation for a Telephone Interview

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request for an Extension of Time

Applicant respectfully petitions for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.

Charge our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: October 30, 2007


Aslam A. Jaffery
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980

Attorney Docket No. 42390P9895
Application No. 09/750,533

14